arXiv:1005.2802v1 [math.LO] 17 May 2010

PRESERVING OLD $([\omega]^{\aleph_0}, \supseteq)$ IS PROPER

SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. We give some sufficient and necessary conditions on a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ for preserving the forcing notion $([\omega]^{\aleph_0}, \supseteq)$ is proper. They cover many reasonable forcing notions.

Anotated Content

§0 Introduction

[I.e. Definition 0.1, we define the problem and some variants.]

§1 Properness of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}[\mathbf{V}]}$ and CH

[Under CH, if non-meagerness of $({}^\omega 2)^{\mathbf{V}}$ is preserved then $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ is proper, (1.1). If $\mathbf{V}$ fail CH, then usually $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ is not proper after a forcing adding a new real and satisfying a relative of being proper, e.g. satisfies c.c.c. or is any true creature forcing.]

§2 General sufficient conditions

[If $\mathbf{V}$ satisfies CH and $\mathbb{Q}$ is c.c.c. then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}[\mathbf{V}]}$ is proper", in 2.1. In 2.3 we replace $\mathcal{A}_*^{\mathbf{V}}$ by a forcing notion $\mathbb{R}$ adding no ω-sequence, $\mathbb{Q}$ is c.c.c. even in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$. Instead "$\mathbb{Q}$ satisfies the c.c.c." it suffices to demand $\mathbb{Q}$. Lastly, 2.6 prove some proper forcing does not preserve.]

Date: April 7, 2010.

Research supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (Grants No. 2002323 and 2006108). Publication 960.

The author thanks Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

0. Introduction

Gitman proved that $\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, P_{\mathcal{P}(\omega)[\mathbf{V}]})$ (see definition below, $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{P}(\omega)^{\mathbf{V}}} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ is the forcing notion $(\{A \in \mathbf{V} : A \subseteq \omega, |A| = \aleph_0), \supseteq^*\})$ where of course $A \supseteq^* B$ means $B \subseteq^* A$ when $\mathbb{Q}$ is adding Cohen (even $> 2^{\aleph_0}$); but no other examples were known even Sacks forcing. Also for e.g. $\mathbf{V} \models$ "$V = L$", we did not know a forcing making it not proper.

We investigate the question "$\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R})$", the proper forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ preserves that the (old) $\mathbb{R}$ is proper for various $\mathbb{R}$'s.

We thank Victoria Gitman for asking us the question and Otmar Spinas and Haim Horowitz for some comments.

Let us state the problem and relatives.

Definition 0.1. 1) Let $\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$ means: $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}$ are forcing notions, $\mathbb{Q}$ is proper and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\mathbb{P}$, i.e. $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{V}}$ is a proper forcing".
2) For $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ let $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ be $\mathcal{A} \backslash [\omega]^{<\aleph_0}$ ordered by inverse almost inclusion.
3) Let $\mathcal{A}_* = \mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}] = ([\omega]^{\aleph_0})^{\mathbf{V}}$.

Observation 0.2. A necessary condition for $\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$ is: $\mathbb{Q}$ is proper and

$(*)_1$ if χ large enough, $N \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$ is countable, $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P} \in N, q_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$ is $(N, \mathbb{Q})$-generic and $r_1 \in N \cap \mathbb{P}$ then we can find (q_2, r_2) such that:
- $\odot$ (a) $q_1 \leq_{\mathbb{Q}} q_2$
  - (b) $r_1 \leq_{\mathbb{R}} r_2$
  - (c) $q_2 \Vdash$ "r_2 is $(N[\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}], \mathbb{P})$-generic".

Definition 0.3. 1) We define $\mathrm{Pr}^-(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}) = \mathrm{Pr}_2(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$ as the necessary condition from 0.2.
2) Let $\mathrm{Pr}_3(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$ mean that $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}$ are forcing notions and for some λ and stationary $S \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ from $\mathbf{V}$ we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\mathbb{P}$ is S-proper".
3) $\mathrm{Pr}_4(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$ similarly but $S \in \mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$, still $S \subseteq ([\lambda]^{\aleph_0})^{\mathbf{V}}$.
4) $\mathrm{Pr}_5(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$ is the statement (A) of 0.4(4) below.

Claim 0.4. *1)* $\mathrm{Pr}^-(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$ *means that for* λ *large enough, letting* $S = ([\lambda]^{\aleph_0})^{\mathbf{V}}$, *we have* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *"*$\mathbb{P}$ *is* S*-proper".*
2) $\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}_1, \mathbb{P}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Pr}_2(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Pr}_3(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$.
3) Also $\mathrm{Pr}_3(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Pr}_4(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{Pr}_5(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$.
4) If $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}$ *are forcing notions,* χ *large enough,* *then* *(A)* $\Leftrightarrow$ *(B) where*

- *(A) for some countable* $N \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$ *and for some* $q \in \mathbb{Q}, p \in \mathbb{P}$ *we have*
  - *(a)* q *is* $(N, \mathbb{Q})$*-generic*
  - *(b)* $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *"*p *is* $(N[G_{\mathbb{Q}}], \mathbb{P})$*-generic"*
- *(B) for some* $q_* \in \mathbb{Q}, p_* \in \mathbb{P}$ *we have* $\mathrm{Pr}(\mathbb{Q}_{\geq q_*}, \mathbb{P}_{\geq p_*})$.

Proof. Easy. $\square_{0.4}$

1. Properness of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ and CH

Claim 1.1. *1) Assume* $\mathbf{V}_0 \models$ CH, $\mathbf{V}_1 \supseteq \mathbf{V}_0$, *e.g.* $\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{V}_0^{\mathbb{Q}}$ *and let* $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}_0]$.

Then $\mathbf{V}_1 \models$ "$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ *is proper", i.e.* $\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}})$ *when* $\mathbf{V}_1 \models$ *"if* $\omega_1^{\mathbf{V}_0}$ *is not collapsed then* $({}^{\omega}2)^{\mathbf{V}_0}$ *is non-meagre".*

Proof. If $\mathbf{V}_1 \models$ "$\omega_1^{\mathbf{V}_0}$ is countable" then recalling $\mathbf{V}_0 \models$ CH clearly $\mathbf{V}_1 \models$ "$\mathcal{A}$ is countable" so we know $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is proper in $\mathbf{V}_1$. So from now on we assume $\aleph_1^{\mathbf{V}_0}$ is not collapsed.

Second[1] in $\mathbf{V}_0$, there is a dense $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ downward dense in it, which under $\subseteq^*$ is downward a tree isomorphic to $\mathcal{T} = {}^{\omega_1 >}(\omega_1)$. In $\mathbf{V}_0$ there is a sequence $\bar{\mathcal{T}} = \langle \mathcal{T}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ which is $\subseteq$-increasing continuous with union $\mathcal{T}$ and each $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ countable. Also there is $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta < \omega_1 \text{ limit} \rangle \in \mathbf{V}_0$ such that $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$, $\mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \omega$. Let $\mathcal{T}'_\delta = \mathcal{T}_\delta {\restriction} \{\eta \in \mathcal{T}_\delta : \ell g(\eta) \in C_\delta\}$.

In $\mathbf{V}_1$ let $N \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$ be countable such that $\bar{\mathcal{T}} \in N$ and let $\delta = \omega_1 \cap N$ clearly $\mathcal{T} \cap N = \mathcal{T}_\delta$. We have to prove the statements

$(*)_0$ "for every $p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}} \cap N$ there is $q \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ above p which is $(N, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}})$-generic".

As $\mathbf{V}_0 \models$ CH and the density of $\mathcal{T}$ this is equivalent to

$(*)_1$ for every $\nu \in \mathcal{T} \cap N = \mathcal{T}_\delta$ there is $\eta \in \mathcal{T}$ which is $(N, \mathcal{T})$-generic and $\nu \leq_{\mathcal{T}} \eta$.

In $\mathbf{V}_0$ we let $\bar{S} = \langle S_\delta : \delta < \omega_1 \text{ a limit ordinal} \rangle$ where $S_\delta = \{\bar{\nu} : \bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is $<_{\mathcal{T}}$-increasing, $\nu_n \in \mathcal{T}'_\delta$, moreover $\ell g(\nu_n)$ is the n-th member of $C_\delta\}$.

As $(\forall \nu \in \mathcal{T}_\delta)(\exists \rho)(\nu <_{\mathcal{T}} \rho \in \mathcal{T}'_\delta)$, clearly $(*)_1$ is equivalent to

$(*)_2$ for every $\nu \in \mathcal{T}'_\delta$ there is $\bar{\nu} \in S_\delta$ such that $\nu \in \mathrm{Rang}(\bar{\nu})$ and $\bar{\nu}$ induce a subset of $\mathcal{T}_\delta$ generic over N (i.e. $(\forall A)[A \in N$ is a dense open subset of $\mathcal{T} \Rightarrow A \cap \{\nu_n : n < \omega\} \neq \emptyset$.

Now a sufficient condition for $(*)_2$ is

$(*)_3$ S_δ, as a set of ω-branches of the tree $\mathcal{T}'_\delta$, is non-meagre.

But in $\mathbf{V}_0, \mathcal{T}'_\delta$ and ${}^{\omega >}\omega$ are isomorphic and S_δ is the set of all ω-branches of $\mathcal{T}'_\delta$, so by an assumption $(*)_3$ holds so we are done. $\square_{1.1}$

Discussion 1.2. However, there can be $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ such that $(\mathcal{A}, \subseteq^*)$ is a variation of Souslin tree.

Claim 1.3. *1) We have* $\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]})$ *when:*

- (a) $\aleph_1^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{Q}]} = \aleph_1$
- (b) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$|\lambda| = \aleph_1$ *where* $\lambda = (2^{\aleph_0})^{\mathbf{V}}$
- (c) *moreover in* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ *letting* $\langle u_i : i < \aleph_1 \rangle$ *be a* $\subseteq$*-increasing continuous sequence of countable subsets of* λ *with union* λ, *the set* $\{i : u_i \in \mathbf{V}\}$ *contains a club (of* ω_1*)*
- (d) *forcing with* $\mathbb{Q}$ *preserves "*$({}^{\omega}2)^{\mathbf{V}}$ *is non-meagre".*

---

[1] this is trivial as $\mathbf{V}_0 \models$ CH, always there is a dense tree with $\mathfrak{h}$ levels by the celebrated theorem of Balcar-Pelant-Simon

2) Assume the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ *satisfies (a) + (d),* $\mathrm{Pr}_4(\mathbb{Q},\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]})$ *as witnessed by* S *and* $\mathbb{Q}$ *is proper.*

Then the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q} * \mathrm{Levy}(\aleph_1,(|\mathbb{Q}|^{\aleph_0})^{\mathbf{V}}) * \mathbb{Q}_{\underset{\sim}{S}}$ *preserves "*$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ *is proper" where* $\mathbb{Q}_S$ *is the (well known) shooting of a club through the stationary subsets of* ω_1 *(to make clause (c) hold).*

Proof. Like 1.1. $\square_{1.3}$

Theorem 1.4. *We have* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ *"*$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ *is not proper"* *when:*

- (a) $\mathbf{V} \models 2^{\aleph_0} \geq \aleph_2$
- (b) $\lambda = \aleph_2$ *or just* λ *is regular,* $\aleph_2 \leq \lambda \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ *and* $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}([\alpha]^{\aleph_0},\subseteq) < \lambda$ *hence (by* [Sh:420]*) there is a stationary* $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \subseteq [\alpha]^{\aleph_0}$ *of cardinality* $< \lambda$
- (c) $\mathfrak{h} < \lambda$
- (d) *the forcing notion* $\mathbb{Q}$ *adds at least one real and is* λ*-newly proper, see Definition 1.5 below.*

Before proving 1.4

Definition 1.5. For $\ell \in \{1,2\}$ and $\lambda > \kappa$ we say that a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}$ is (λ,κ)-newly proper (omitting κ_κ means $\kappa = \aleph_0$ and we define newly $(\lambda,<\chi)$-proper similarly) when: if $\bar{N} = \langle (N_\eta,\nu_\eta) : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\lambda\rangle$ satisifes ⊛ below and $\mathbb{Q} \in N_{<>}, p \in \mathbb{Q} \cap N_{<>}$ then we can find $q, \underset{\sim}{\eta}$ such that $\boxtimes_\ell$ below holds where:

- ⊛ for some cardinal $\chi > \lambda$
  - (a) $N_\eta \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi),\in,<^*_\chi)$ is countable
  - (b) if $\nu \triangleleft \eta$ then $N_\nu \prec N_\eta$
  - (c) $N_{\eta_1} \cap N_{\eta_2} = N_{\eta_1 \cap \eta_2}$ if $\kappa = \aleph_0$ and $N^\kappa_{\eta_1} \cap N^\kappa_{\eta_2} = N^\kappa_{\eta_1 \cap \eta_2}$ generally where $N^\kappa_\eta := \cup\{v \in N^\kappa_\eta : |v| \leq \kappa\}$
  - (d) $\nu_\eta \in N_\eta \backslash \cup\{N^\kappa_{\eta\restriction m} : m < \ell g(\eta)\}$ hence $\nu_\eta \notin \cup\{N_\nu : \neg(\eta \trianglelefteq \nu)$ and $\nu \in {}^{\omega>}\lambda\}$
  - (e) $\nu_\eta \in {}^{\ell g(\eta)}\lambda$ and $\ell < \ell g(\eta) \Rightarrow \nu_{\eta\restriction\ell} \trianglelefteq \nu_\eta$
- ⊠ (a) $p \leq_{\mathbb{Q}} q$
  - (b) $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\cup\{N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}\restriction n}[\underset{\sim}{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbb{Q}}] : n < \omega\} \cap \mathbf{V} = \cup\{N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}\restriction n} : n < \omega\}$"
  - (c) $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\eta} \in {}^\omega\lambda$ is new, i.e. $\underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin ({}^\omega\lambda)^{\mathbf{V}}$"
  - $(c)^+$ moreover if $\kappa > \aleph_0$ and $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbf{V}$ is a sub-tree of ${}^{\omega>}\lambda$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$ then $\underset{\sim}{\eta} \notin \lim(\mathcal{T})$, i.e. $\{\underset{\sim}{\eta}\restriction n : n < \omega\} \notin \mathcal{T}$.

For a proper forcing notion adding a new real it is quite easy to be $\aleph_1$-newly proper; e.g.

Claim 1.6. *Assuming* $2^{\aleph_0} \geq \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_1$*, sufficient conditions for "*$\mathbb{Q}$ *is* λ*-newly proper are:*

- (a) $\mathbb{Q}$ *is c.c.c. and add a new real*
- (b) $\mathbb{Q}$ *is Sacks forcing*
- (c) $\mathbb{Q}$ *is a tree-like creature forcing in the sense of Roslanowski-Shelah* [RoSh:470].

Proof. Easy; for clause (a) we use $q = p$; in ⊞ in the definition. For clauses (b),(c) we use fusion but in the next step use members of $N_\eta \cap \mathbb{Q}$ for $\eta \in {}^n\lambda$ we get as many distinct η's as we can. $\square_{1.6}$

Proof. Proof of 1.4 Let χ be large enough and for transparency, $x \in \mathcal{H}(\chi)$.

By Rubin-Shelah [RuSh:117] in $\mathbf{V}$ there are sequences $\langle N_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\lambda\rangle$; $\langle \nu_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega>}\lambda\rangle$ such that:

$\boxdot_1$ (a) $N_\eta \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$
(b) $\mathbb{Q}, x \in N_\eta$
(c) N_η is countable
(d) $N_{\eta_1} \cap N_{\eta_2} = N_{\eta_1 \cap \eta_2}$
(e) $\nu_\eta \in {}^{\ell g(\eta)}({}^\omega 2)$
(f) $\nu_\eta \in N_\eta$
(g) if $\eta_1 \in {}^{\omega>}(\lambda)$ and $\neg(\eta \trianglelefteq \eta_1)$ then $\nu_\eta \notin N_{\eta_1}$
(h) $\nu_{\eta_1}(\ell_1) = \nu_{\eta_2}(\ell_2) \Rightarrow \ell_1 = \ell_2 \wedge \eta_1{\restriction}(\ell_1 + 1) = \eta_2{\restriction}(\ell_2 + 1)$.

Now for each $\eta \in {}^\omega\lambda$ let $N_\eta = \cup\{N_{\eta\restriction k} : k < \omega\}$; we can add:

(i) if $\ell g(\eta) = n+1$ then $\nu_\eta(n) > \sup(N_{\eta\restriction n} \cap \lambda)$ and even $\nu_\eta(n) > \sup\{N_\rho \cap \lambda : \rho \in {}^{\omega>}(\nu_\eta(n))\}$
(j) if $\eta \in {}^\omega\lambda$ is increasing, then $\sup(N_\eta \cap \lambda) = \sup(\mathrm{Rang}(\eta))$.

Why is this sufficient? By Balcar-Pelant-Simon [BPS80] there is $\mathcal{T} \subseteq [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$ such that

$\boxdot_2$ (α) $(\mathcal{T}, {}^*\supseteq)$ is a tree with $\mathfrak{h}$ levels ($\mathfrak{h}$ is a cardinal invariant, a regular cardinal $\in [\aleph_1, 2^{\aleph_0}]$, with a root and each node has $2^{\aleph_0}$ many immediate successors, i.e. $\mathcal{T}$ has splitting to $2^{\aleph_0}$)
(β) $\mathcal{T}$ is dense in $([\omega]^{\aleph_0}, {}^*\supseteq)$, i.e. $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{P}(\omega)^{\mathbf{V}}} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ recalling 0.1(2).

Choose $\bar{h}$ such that

$\boxdot_3$ $\bar{h} = \langle h_p : p \in \mathcal{T}\rangle$ satisfies h_p is one to one from $\mathrm{suc}_{\mathcal{T}}(p)$ onto $2^{\aleph_0} \backslash \{h_{p_1}(p_2) : p_1 <_{\mathcal{T}} p_2 \leq_{\mathcal{T}} p$ and $p_2 \in \mathrm{suc}_{\mathcal{T}}(p_1)\}$.

So without loss of generality

$\boxdot_4$ $\mathcal{T} \in N_{<>}$ and $\bar{h} \in N_{<>}$.

As $\mathbb{Q}$ is newly λ-newly proper there are $\underset{\sim}{\eta}, q$ as in $\boxtimes_1$ of Definition 1.5. Let $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ be generic over $\mathbf{V}$ such that $q \in \mathbf{G}$, let $\eta = \underset{\sim}{\eta}[G]$ and $M_2 := N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[G]} := \cup\{N_{\eta\restriction n}[\mathbf{G}] : n < \omega\}$, so $M \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}]}, \mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}}, \in)$ is countable, pedantically $(|M|, \mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}} \cap |M|, \in {\restriction}|M|) \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}]}, \mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}}, \in {\restriction}\mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}]})$.

By $\boxtimes$ as $q \in \mathbf{G}$ we have $M_1 = M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}}$ is $\cup\{N_{\eta\restriction n} : n < \omega\}$, and of course $M_1 \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi), \in)$. Toward contradiction assume $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}] \models$ "$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ is proper", hence some $p_* \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ is $(M_2, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]})$-generic. But $\mathcal{T}$ is dense in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ so without loss of generality $p_* \in \mathcal{T}$ and p_* is $(M_2, \mathcal{T})$-generic.

Clearly $\mathfrak{h} \in N_{<>}$ or we may demand this, so without loss of generality $\eta \in {}^{\omega>}\lambda \Rightarrow N_\eta \cap \mathfrak{h} = N_{<>} \cap \mathfrak{h}$. For any $\alpha < \lambda$ let

$$\mathcal{I}_\alpha = \{p \in \mathcal{T} : \text{ for some } p_0 \in \mathcal{T} \text{ we have } p \in \ \mathrm{suc}_{\mathcal{T}}(p_0) \text{ and } h_{p_0}(p) = \alpha\}$$

and letting $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ be the α-th level of $\mathcal{T}$

$$\mathcal{I}^+_\alpha = \{p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]} : p \text{ is above some member of } \mathcal{T}_\alpha\}.$$

Now clearly (in $\mathbf{V}$ and in $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}]$):

$(*)_1$ (a) $\mathcal{I}_\alpha$ is a pre-dense subset of $\mathcal{T}$ (and of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$)

  (b) $\mathcal{I}^+_\alpha$ is dense open decreasing with α

  (c) if $p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ then for every large enough $\alpha < \lambda, p \notin \mathcal{I}^+_\alpha$.

Also if $\alpha \in \lambda \cap N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]}$ then $\mathcal{I}_\alpha \in N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]}$ and the set $\{p \in \mathcal{T} \cap N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]} : p \le_{\mathcal{T}} p_*\}$ is not empty, let p^*_α be in it and let its level in $\mathcal{T}$ be γ^*_α

$(*)_2$ if $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h} \cap N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]}$ then $\gamma^*_\alpha \in N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]} \cap \mathfrak{h} = N_{<>} \cap \mathfrak{h}$ hence

$(*)_3$ in $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}]$ the following function h_* is well defined

  (a) $\mathrm{Dom}(h_*) = N_{<>} \cap \mathfrak{h}$

  (b) $h_*(\gamma)$ is the unique $p \in N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]} \cap \mathcal{T}$ of level γ which is $\le_{\mathcal{T}} p_*$.

also by the choice of $\bar{h}$ (and genericity) clearly

$(*)_4$ $\mathrm{Rang}(h_*)$ is equal to $u := (2^{\aleph_0}) \cap N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]}$.

Lastly,

$(*)_5$ $h_* \in \mathbf{V}$.

[Why? As its domain, $N_{<>} \cap \mathfrak{h}$ belongs to $\mathbf{V}$ and $h_*(\gamma)$ is defined from $\langle \mathcal{T}, \gamma, p_* \rangle \in \mathbf{V}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is a tree.]

$(*)_6$ (a) from $u := \lambda \cap N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]}$ we can define $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}]$

  (b) $u \in \cup\{N_{\underset{\sim}{\eta}\restriction n[\mathbf{G}]} \cap \lambda : n < \omega\}$.

[Why? By the choice of $\bar{N}$.]

Together we get that $\underset{\sim}{\eta}[\mathbf{G}] \in \mathbf{V}$, contradiction. $\square_{1.4}$

Claim 1.7. *We have* $\neg\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]})$ *when*

(a) $2^{\aleph_0} \ge \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > \kappa = \mathfrak{h}$

(b) $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}([\alpha]^{\le\kappa}, \subseteq) \le \kappa) < \lambda$

(c) $\mathbb{Q}$ *is* (λ, κ)*-newly proper.*

Proof. Similar to 1.4. $\square_{1.7}$

Conclusion 1.8. If $\mathfrak{h} < 2^{\aleph_0}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ is a $(\mathfrak{h}^+, \mathfrak{h})$-newly proper then $\neg\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]})$.

2. General sufficient conditions

Claim 2.1. *Assume CH, i.e.* $\mathbf{V} \models$ *CH.*

If $\mathbb{Q}$ *is c.c.c.* then $\mathrm{Pr}_2(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]})$.

Remark 2.2. 1) This works replacing $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ by any $\aleph_1$-complete $\mathbb{P}$ and strengthening the conclusions to Pr_1, see 2.3.
2) See Definition 0.3(1).

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$. The point is

- $(*)$ if $r \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$ is a dense open subset of $\mathbb{P}$" then there is r' such that
  - (a) $r \le_{\mathbb{P}} r'$
  - (b) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$r' \in \mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$".

Why $(*)$ holds? We try (all in $\mathbf{V}$) to choose (r_α, q_α) by induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$ such that

- $\circledast$ (a) $r_0 = r$
  - (b) $r_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is $\le_{\mathbb{P}}$-increasing
  - (c) $q_\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$
  - (d) q_α, q_β are incompatible in $\mathbb{Q}$ for $\beta < \alpha$
  - (e) $q_\alpha \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$r_{\alpha+1} \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$".

We cannot succeed because $\mathbb{Q} \models$ c.c.c.

For $\alpha = 0$ no problem as only clause (a) is relevant.

For α limit - easy as $\mathbb{P}$ is $\aleph_1$-complete (and the only relevant clause is (b)).

For $\alpha = \beta + 1$, we first ask:

Question: Is $\langle q_\gamma : \gamma < \beta \rangle$ a maximal antichain of $\mathbb{Q}$?

If yes, then r_β is as required: if $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbb{Q}} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ is generic over $\mathbf{V}$ then for some $\gamma < \beta, q_\gamma \in \mathbf{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ hence $r_{\gamma+1} \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}[\mathbf{G}_Q]$ but $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}[\mathbf{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}]$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{P}$ and is open and $r_{\gamma+1} \le_{\mathbb{R}} r_\beta$ so $r_\beta \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}[\mathbf{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}]$.
If no, let $q^\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ be incompatible with q_γ for every $\gamma < \beta$. Recalling $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$ is dense and open" the set $X_\beta = \{r \in \mathbb{P}$: for some $q, q^\beta \le_{\mathbb{Q}} q$ and $q \Vdash$ "$r \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$"$\}$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{P}$ hence there is a member of X_β above r_β, let r_α be such member. By $r_\alpha \in X_\beta$, there is $q, q^\beta \le q$ such that $q \Vdash r_\alpha \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$. But we could have chosen q_β as such q, contradiction, hence $(*)$ indeed holds and this is clearly enough. $\square_{2.1}$

We can weaken the demand on the second forcing (here $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$) and strengthen the conclusion to $\mathrm{Pr}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}[\mathbf{V}]})$.

Claim 2.3. *If (A) then (B) where:*

- (A) (a) $\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q}$ *are forcing notions*
  - (b) $\mathbb{Q}$ *is c.c.c. moreover* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{R}}$ "$\mathbb{Q}$ *is c.c.c.*"
  - (c) *forcing with* $\mathbb{P}$ *and no new* ω*-sequences,*[2] *from* λ
  - (d) $\mathbb{Q}$ *has cardinality* $\le \lambda$
- (B) (a) *if* $\mathbb{P}$ *is proper in* $\mathbf{V}$ then $\mathrm{Pr}_2(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$

---

[2] if you assume $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}$ are proper, $\lambda = \aleph_0$ the proof may be easier to read

(b) *for every $\mathbb{Q}$-name $\underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$ of a dense open subset of $\mathbb{R}$, the set* $\mathcal{J} = \{r \in \mathbb{P} : \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{“} r \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}} \text{”}\}$ *is dense and open.*

Proof. Let $\langle q_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa := |\mathbb{Q}|\rangle$ list $\mathbb{Q}$.

For every $r \in \mathbb{P}$ we define a sequence η_r of ordinals $< \kappa$ as follows:

$\circledast_1$ $\eta_r(\alpha)$ is the minimal ordinal $\varepsilon < \kappa$ such that
  (a) $q_\varepsilon \Vdash$ “$r \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$”
  (b) if $\beta < \alpha$ then $q_\varepsilon, q_{\eta_r(\beta)}$ are incompatible in $\mathbb{Q}$”.

Now

$\circledast_2$ (a) η_r is well defined
  (b) $\ell g(\eta_r) < \omega_1$.

[Why? As $\mathbb{Q} \models$ c.c.c.]

Note

$\circledast_3$ if $r_1 \le_{\mathbb{P}} r_2$ then either $\eta_{r_1} \trianglelefteq \eta_{r_2}$ or for some $\alpha < \ell g(\eta_{r_1})$ we have

$$\eta_{r_1} \restriction \alpha = \eta_{r_2} \restriction \alpha$$

$$\eta_{r_1}(\alpha) > \eta_{r_2}(\alpha).$$

[Why? Think about the definition.]

For $s \in \mathbb{P}$ let η'_s be $\cap\{\eta_{s_1} : s \le_{\mathbb{P}} s_1\}$, i.e. the longest common initial segment of $\{\eta_{s_1} : s \le_{\mathbb{P}} s_1\}$; clearly $s_1 \le_R s_2 \Rightarrow \eta'_{s_1} \trianglelefteq \eta'_{s_2}$. So

$\circledast_4$ $\underset{\sim}{\eta}^* = \cup\{\eta'_s : s \in \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{G}}_{\mathbb{P}}\}$ is an $\mathbb{P}$-name of a sequence of pairwise incompatible members of $\mathbb{Q}$

but forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ preserve “$\mathbb{Q} \models$ c.c.c.”, so $\ell g(\underset{\sim}{\eta}^*)$ is countable in $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}_{\mathbb{P}}]$. But forcing by $\mathbb{P}$ adds no new ω-sequences to $\kappa = |\mathbb{Q}|$ (and $\mathbb{Q}$ is infinite) and $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}_{\mathbb{R}}]$ has the same $\aleph_1$ as $\mathbf{V}$ and

$\circledast_5$ $\underset{\sim}{\eta}^*$ is a sequence of countable length of ordinals $< \kappa$ so is old,

hence

$\circledast_6$ the following set is dense open in $\mathbb{P}$

$$\mathcal{J} = \{r \in \mathbb{P} : r \text{ forces } (\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}) \text{ that } \underset{\sim}{\eta}^* = \eta^*_r \text{ for some } \eta^*_r \in \mathbf{V}\}$$

$\circledast_7$ if $r \in \mathcal{J}$ then $\langle q_{\eta^*_r(\varepsilon)} : \varepsilon < \ell g(\eta^*_r)\rangle$ is a maximal antichain of $\mathbb{Q}$.

[Why? As in the proof of 2.1.]

Fix $r_* \in \mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha < \ell g(\eta^*_{r_*})$ let

$(*)_1$ $\mathcal{J}_{r_*,\alpha} = \{r \in \mathbb{R} : r_* \le_{\mathbb{P}} r$ and $q_{\eta^*_{r_*}(\alpha)}$ forces (for $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$) that $r \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}\}$.

[Why? Assume $\mathbb{P} \models$ “$r_* \le r_1$” so $r_1 \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ “$\underset{\sim}{\eta}^*(\alpha) = \underset{\sim}{\eta}^*_{r_*}(\alpha)$” hence for some r_2 we have $\mathbb{P} \models$ “$r_1 \le r_2$” and $\eta^* \restriction (\alpha + 1) \trianglelefteq \eta'_{r_2}$, so by clause ($\alpha$) of $\circledast_1$ we have $q_{\eta^*_{r_*}(\varepsilon)} \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ “$r_2 \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$” hence $r_2 \in \mathcal{J}_{r_*,\alpha}$ as required.]

So

$(*)_2$ $\mathcal{J}_{r_*,\alpha}$ is a dense open subset of $\mathbb{P}_{\geq r_*}$ (i.e. above r_*).

As forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ add no new ω-sequence

$(*)_3$ $\mathcal{J}^+_{r_*} := \cap\{\mathcal{J}_{r_*,\alpha} : \alpha < \ell g(\eta^*_{r_*})\}$ is dense open in $\mathbb{R}$ above r_*.

[Why? Let $\mathcal{J}^*_{r_*,\alpha}$ be a maximal antichain $\subseteq \mathcal{J}_{r_*,\alpha}$ for $\alpha < \ell g(\eta^*_{r_*})$ let $\underset{\sim}{f}$ be the $\mathbb{P}$-name of $\{(\alpha, q) : \alpha < \ell g(\eta^*_{r_*})$ and $q \in \mathcal{J}_{r_*,\alpha} \cap \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}}\}$ so $r_* \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{f}$ a function from $\ell g(\eta^*_{r_*})$ to $\mathbb{P}$" hence $r_* \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{f} \in \mathbf{V}$".]

Clearly by the definition (recalling $\circledast_7$, as in the proof of 2.1)

$(*)_4$ if $r \in \mathcal{J}^+_{r_*}$ then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ "$r \in \underset{\sim}{\mathcal{I}}$".

As $\cup\{\mathcal{J}^+_{r_*} : r_* \in \mathcal{J}\}$ is dense open in $\mathbb{P}$ we are done proving clause (β) of the claim and we are left with proving clause (α) which follows by the proof of 2.1. $\square_{2.3}$

Claim 2.4. *In 2.1, 2.3 we can replace "c.c.c." by strongly proper.*

Proof. Should be similar. $\square$

Remark 2.5. But such $\mathbb{Q}$ preserves "$({}^{\omega}2)^{\mathbf{V}}$-non-meagre".

Claim 2.6. *1) There is a proper forcing $\mathbb{Q}$ which forces "$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}[\mathbf{V}]}$ as a forcing notion is not proper", (i.e. $\neg\mathrm{Pr}_1(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P})$).*
2) Even (A) of 0.4(3) fail, i.e. $\neg\mathrm{Pr}_5(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}[\mathbf{V}]})$.

Proof. We use the proof of [Sh:f, Ch.17,Sec.2] and references. We repeat in short.

We use a finite iteration so let $\mathbb{P}_0$ be the trivial forcing notion, $\mathbb{P}_{k+1} = \mathbb{P}_k * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_k$ for $k \leq 3$ and the $\mathbb{P}_k$-name $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_k$ is defined below.

Step A: $\mathbb{Q}_0 = \mathrm{Levy}(\aleph_1, 2^{\aleph_0})$ so $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_0}$ "CH".

Step B: $\mathbb{Q}_1$ is Cohen forcing.

Step C: In $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_1}, \mathbb{Q}_2$ in the Levy collapse $2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$ to $\aleph_1$, i.e. $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \mathrm{Levy}(\aleph_1, \beth_2)^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{Q}_0]}$.

Step D: Let $\mathcal{T} = ({}^{(\omega_1>)}\omega_1)^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_1]}$ a tree, so $\lim_{\omega_1}(\mathcal{T})^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_1]} = \lim_{\omega_1}(\mathcal{T})^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_2]} = \lim_{\omega_1}(\mathcal{T})^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_3]}$ and

$(*)_1$ in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_1}, \mathcal{T}$ is isomorphic to a dense subset of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}[\mathbb{P}_1]}$.

So in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_3}$ there is a list $\langle \eta^*_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle$ of $\lim_{\omega_1}(\mathcal{T})^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_1]}$. Let $\langle \eta^*_\varepsilon {\restriction} [\gamma_\varepsilon, \omega_1) : \varepsilon < \omega_2\rangle$ be pairwise disjoint end segments.

Step E: In $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_3}$ there is $\mathbb{Q}_3$, a c.c.c. forcing notion specializing $\mathcal{T}$ in the sense of [Sh:74], i.e. $h_* : \mathcal{T} \to \omega, h$ is increasing in $\mathcal{T}$ except on the end segment $\underset{\sim}{\eta}^*_\varepsilon {\restriction} [\gamma_\varepsilon, \omega_1)$, i.e. $\rho <_{\mathcal{T}} \nu \wedge h_*(\rho) = h(\nu) \Rightarrow (\exists \varepsilon)[\rho, \nu \in \{\eta^*_\varepsilon {\restriction} \gamma : \gamma \in [\gamma_\varepsilon, \omega_1)\}$

$\boxtimes$ after forcing with $\mathbb{P}_4 = \mathbb{Q}_0 * \mathbb{Q}_1 * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_2 * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_3$, i.e. in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_4}$ the forcing notion $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{A}_*[\mathbf{V}]}$ is not proper, in fact it collapses $\aleph_1$.

Why? Recall $(*)_1$ and note

$(*)_2$ $\mathcal{I}_n := \{\rho \in \mathcal{T} : (\forall \nu)(\rho \leq_{\mathcal{T}} \nu \to h_*(\nu) \neq n\}$ is dense open in $\mathcal{T}$ (in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}_0 * \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{Q}}_1}$)

and trivially

$(*)_3$ $\bigcap\limits_n \mathcal{I}_n = \emptyset$; in fact if $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ is generic, then

- (A) $\mathbf{G}$ is a branch of $\mathcal{T}$ of order type $\omega_1^{\mathbf{V}}$ let its name be $\langle \underset{\sim}{\rho}_\gamma : \gamma < \omega_1 \rangle$
- (B) letting $\underset{\sim}{\gamma}_n = \operatorname{Min}\{\gamma < \omega_2 : \underset{\sim}{\rho}_\gamma \in \mathcal{I}_n\}$ we have $\Vdash_{\mathcal{T}}$ "$\{\underset{\sim}{\gamma}_n : n < \omega\}$ is unbounded in ω_1".

$\square_{2.6}$

References

[BPS80] Bohuslav Balcar, Jan Pelant, and Petr Simon, *The space of ultrafilters on N covered by nowhere dense sets*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **CX** (1980), 11–24.

[Sh:f] Saharon Shelah, *Proper and improper forcing*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer, 1998.

[Sh:74] ———, *Appendix to: "Models with second-order properties. II. Trees with no undefined branches" (Annals of Mathematical Logic 14(1978), no. 1, 73–87)*, Annals of Mathematical Logic **14** (1978), 223–226.

[RuSh:117] Matatyahu Rubin and Saharon Shelah, *Combinatorial problems on trees: partitions, Δ-systems and large free subtrees*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **33** (1987), 43–81.

[Sh:420] Saharon Shelah, *Advances in Cardinal Arithmetic*, Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993, N.W. Sauer et al (eds.). 0708.1979, pp. 355–383.

[RoSh:470] Andrzej Roslanowski and Saharon Shelah, *Norms on possibilities I: forcing with trees and creatures*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society **141** (1999), no. 671, xii + 167, math.LO/9807172.

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel, and, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://shelah.logic.at`